

## Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00472 01 OF 02 272143Z  
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07  
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00  
SAJ-01 MC-02 /062 W  
-----272226Z 074661 /73

R 271900Z JAN 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1401  
SECDEF WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 0472

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: NATO MILI OCON  
SUBJECT: PERIODIC ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM (PAPS)

REF: A. AC/259-D/516 DTD 4 OCT 76  
B. STATE 013138 DTG 192350Z JAN 77.

SUMMARY. THE AD HOC STUDY GROUP ON A PERIODIC ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM HELD ITS FIRST MEETING ON JAN 21. THE MEETING WAS ORGANIZATIONAL IN NATURE, CONSISTING PRIMARILY OF A DISCUSSION OF A PROGRAM OF WORK FOR THE STUDY GROUP. THE GROUP AGREED THAT, BEFORE PROCEEDING WITH A COHERENT ANALYSIS OF EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT SCHEDULES, IT WILL CONSOLIDATE THE US AND CANADIAN DATA - DUE THE END OF FEB - WITH THE EPG DATA ALREADY RECEIVED. THE GROUP ALSO AGREED TO SEEK GUIDANCE ON THE QUESTION OF WHETHER NATIONS WOULD CONSENT TO PROVIDE, ON FEB 17, PRESENTATIONS ON NATIONAL ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEMS BY EXPERTS FROM CAPITALS ACTION REQUESTED. WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY FEB 4, 1977 ON THE FEASIBILITY OF MAKING A PRESENTATION ON THE US ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM ALONG LINES INDICATED IN PARA 6.  
END SUMMARY.

1. THE AD HOC STUDY GROUP ON A PERIODIC ARMAMENTS PLAN-  
CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00472 01 OF 02 272143Z

NING SYSTEM (PAPS) HELD ITS FIRST MEETING ON JANUARY 21, 1977. PORTUGAL DID NOT ATTEND. HOWEVER, ALL OTHER NATIONS WERE REPRESENTED BY THEIR NATIONAL ARMAMENTS DIRECTORS' REPRESENTATIVES (NADREP). IN ADDITION, REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE IMS, SHAPE, AND THE IS (PLANS AND POLICY AND DEFENSE SUPPORT DIVISIONS) PARTICIPATED. UK NADREP (PERRY) CHAIRED THE MEETING.

2. THE CHAIRMAN REVIEWED THE GROUP'S TERMS OF REFERENCE (TOR) CONTAINED IN THE ANNEX TO REF A. THE CHAIRMAN

NOTED IN PARTICULAR THAT THE DIRECTION IN THE TOR TO "ASSESS" WHETHER A PAPS WOULD IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF COLLABORATION AND STANDARDIZATION OF EQUIPMENT AMONG ALLIANCE FORCES, MADE THE TASK OF THE GROUP A FAR-REACHING ONE. HE NOTED THAT C-M(66)33, THE DOCUMENT WHICH PROVIDES THE RAISON D'ETRE FOR THE CNAD AND ITS MAIN GROUPS, ALREADY REQUIRES THE MAIN GROUPS TO REVIEW NATIONAL PROGRAMS. HOWEVER, HE SAID, IT APPEARED TO HIM THAT THIS EFFORT IS NOT COMPREHENSIVE OR SYSTEMATIC. YET, HE DID NOT WANT TO FORECLOSE ON THE OPTION THAT THE STUDY GROUP MIGHT FIND THAT A PAPS IS BEST OBTAINED BY A REVISION TO C-M(66) 33 WHICH WILL STRENGTHEN THE REQUIREMENT OF THE MAIN GROUPS TO REVIEW NATIONAL PROGRAMS IN A COMPREHENSIVE AND SYSTEMATIC WAY-PERHAPS WITH A CENTRLIZED REVIEW MECHANISM. IN OTHER WORDS, HE SAID, THERE IS NO REQUIREMENT THAT THIS STUDY GROUP RECOMMEND A NEW ORGANIZATION MERELY FOR THE SAKE OF A PAPS IF THE SAME END CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH SOME MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING STRUCTURES. FINALLY, HE NOTED THAT THE AD HOC COMMITTEE ON EQUIPMENT INTEROPERABILITY HAD REFERRED ITS PROCEDURES TO ENSURE ADEQUATE INTEROPERABILITY OF FUTURE EQUIPMENT (IFE) TO THIS STUDY GROUP TO DEVELOP AND EVOLVE PAPS AND IFE IN A COORDINATED MANNER.

3. THE BELGIAN REP COMMENTED THAT THERE WERE THREE PREREQUISITIES WHICH MUST BE FULFILLED IN ORDER FOR THIS CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00472 01 OF 02 272143Z

GROUP TO ACHIEVE TANGIBLE RESULTS:

(A) THE GROUP MUST WORK ON A LONGER PERIOD OF TIME -- TEN YEARS IS THE MINIMUM;

(B) FOR MAXIMUM STABILITY IN DEVELOPING NATIONAL PLANS, REQUIREMENTS OF MILITARY AUTHORITIES MUST BE GLOBALIZED, I.E. NATIONS SHOULD NOT HAVE A REQUIREMENT SPRUNG ON THEM AFTER THEIR NATIONAL PLANS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED AND ARE PROCEEDING; AND

(C) NATO AUTHORITIES MUST SET PRIORITIES FOR ALL REQUIREMENTS DEVELOPED.

4. THE IS (PLANS AND POLICY) REP SAID THAT IT WAS ESSENTIAL THAT PAPS RUN ALONGSIDE THE DEFENSE REVIEW PROCESS. ALTHOUGH THE DEFENSE REVIEW PROCESS ONLY LOOKS FIVE YEARS AHEAD, PAPS IS BOUND TO LOOK BEYOND FIVE YEARS BECAUSE OF ITS CONSIDERATION OF RESOURCES. HE NOTED, AS AN EXAMPLE, THE SHIP CONSTRUCTION PROGRAMS, BECAUSE OF THE INHERENT LONGER LIFE SPAN OF SHIPS AND THE NECESSITY TO COMMIT LARGE AMOUNTS OF RESOURCES IN CONSTRUCTION, REQUIRE A LONGER PROJECTION. ALSO, HE SAID THAT FROM THE BEGINNING, PAPS SHOULD KNOW WHAT THE DEFENSE REVIEW PROCESS IS PROVIDING SO THAT THE TWO DO NOT CLASH. COMMENT. WE AGREE. IT WILL BE INCUMBENT ON THE DEFENSE REVIEW COMMITTEE, AS WELL AS COMMITTEES DIRECTLY CONCERNED WITH

STANDARDIZATION AND INTEROPERABILITY, TO MESH THEIR EFFORTS. IDEALLY, FORCE PROPOSALS SHOULD RECOGNIZE BOTH THE MODERNIZATION NEEDS OF NATIONAL FORCES FOR NATO, AND THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STANDARDIZATION WHICH NATIONS HOULD UTILIZE TO FULFILL THESE NEEDS IN THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE WAY. LINKING PAPS TOO CLOSELY WITH THE DEFENSE REVIEW PROCESS MIGHT, HOWEVER, COMPLICATE THE PAPS PROBLEM IN THE SHORT TERM DUE TO LACK OF FRENCH AND GREEK PARTICIPATION IN THE PROCESS. END COMMENT.

5. THE IS (DEFENSE SUPPORT) REP SAID THAT NATO HAD MOVED FROM THE RIGID NATO BASIC MILITARY REQUIREMENTS (NBMR) CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 NATO 00472 01 OF 02 272143Z

PROGRAM WITH A "DASH TOWARD FREEDOM" IN THE ORGANIZATION SET UP IN C-M(66)33; AND PERHAPS A MIDDLE-GROUND APPROACH WAS AVAILABLE. HE WENT ON TO SAY THAT THERE WAS A PLETHORA OF INFORMATION AVAILABLE IN THE CNAD MAIN GROUPS BUT IT WAS NOT NOW IN A COHERENT FORM. THE OBJECTIVE IN PAPS MIGHT BE TO GET A BETTER DESCRIPTION OF NATIONAL PLANS TO IDENTIFY OPPORTUNITIES FOR COLLABORATION AND GAPS IN PLANS, AND THEN TO DEVELOP A FORMAT TO COORDINATE WHAT IS BEING DONE NATIONALLY WITH WHAT IS BEING DONE IN THE MAIN GROUPS.

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 NATO 00472 02 OF 02 272153Z  
ACTION EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-04 INR-07 L-03 ACDA-07  
NSAE-00 PA-01 SS-15 PRS-01 SP-02 USIA-06 TRSE-00  
SAJ-01 MC-02 /062 W  
-----272227Z 074834 /73

R 271900Z JAN 77  
FM USMISSION NATO  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC 1402  
SECDEF WASHDC

C O N F I D E N T I A L SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 0472

6. TURNING TO THE PROGRAM OF WORK FOR THE STUDY GROUP, THE CHAIRMAN SAID THAT THERE WERE TWO KINDS OF INFORMATION WHICH THE GROUP NEEDED:

(A) THE VIEWS OF ALL NATIONS, THE IS AND THE IMS ON WHAT THEY EXPECT TO RECIEVE FROM A PAPS END PRODUCT AND ITS MOST DESIRABLE FORM; AND

(B) INFORMATION ON NATIONAL PLANNING SYSTEMS IN ORDER TO MAKE USE OF EXPERIENCE GAINED NATIONALLY. CONCERNING THE FIRST, THE STUDY GROUP COULD ITSELF EXCHANGE VIEWS ON THE END PRODUCT AND A FORMAT, RECEIVING INPUTS

FROM CAPITALS. REGARDING THE SECOND, RECOGNIZING THAT PRESENTATIONS ON NATIONAL PLANNING SYSTEMS WERE BEST GIVEN BY EXPERTS FROM CAPITALS, THE CHAIRMAN SUGGESTED SCHEDULING A LENGTHY MEETING (PERHAPS TWO DAYS) AT WHICH NATIONS AND NATO MILITARY AUTHORITIES WOULD MAKE THEIR PRESENTATIONS. SUBMISSION OF PAPERS ON NATIONAL PROCESSES IS A SECONDARY, BUT LESS DESIRABLE, OPTION TO THE ORAL PRESENTATIONS BY NATIONAL EXPERTS. THE CHAIRMAN SAID THAT THE FRAMEWORK FOR THE PRESENTATIONS NEED NOT BE STRICT IN ORDER TO GET A VARIETY OF VIEWS. HE SUGGESTED THAT THE PRESENTATIONS CONTAIN A DESCRIPTION OF THE PURPOSE OF THE PLANNING SYSTEM AND ITS INTEGRAL PARTS AND HOW THE ANNUAL (OR PERIODIC) PLAN IS DEVELOPED, I.E. FACTORS TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, WORK METHODS AND EXAMPLES OF RESULTS. CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 NATO 00472 02 OF 02 272153Z

THE GROUP AGREED IN PRINCIPLE WITH THE CHAIRMAN'S PROPOSED PROGRAM OF WORK AND TO CONSULT CAPITALS FOR COMMENT AND EXPRESSION OF WILLINGNESS TO MAKE PRESENTATIONS ON FEB 17. COMMENT. FEB 17 WAS A TENTATIVELY AGREED DATE. THE STRESS IS TO GET SOMETHING MOVING ON A PAPS AS SOON AS POSSIBLE. THE ANALYSIS OF EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT SCHEDULES CANNOT TAKE PLACE UNTIL AFTER THE END OF FEBRUARY BECAUSE OF DATA SUBMISSION COMMITMENTS BY THE US AND CANADA. IN ADDITION, THE STUDY GROUP WILL NEED SOME TIME, AFTER RECEIVING THE PRESENTATIONS ON THE VARIOUS NATIONAL PROGRAMS, TO DEVELOP A RECOMMENDED APPROACH FOR A PAPS TO THE CNAD IN APRIL. END COMMENT.

7. THERE WAS NO DETAILED DISCUSSION OF A PAPS BECAUSE OF THE ORGANIZATIONAL NATURE OF THE MEETING AND THE NEED TO OUTLINE A PROGRAM OF WORK AS A FIRST STEP. NO REPRESENTATIVES HAD SPECIFIC GUIDANCE. HOWEVER, THE CHAIRMAN DID REQUEST THAT COMMENTS ON THE AD HOC COMMITTEE'S IF PROCEEDURES SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARIAT FOR COMPILATION IN A REVISED DOCUMENT. US RECOMMENDED CHANGES, REF B, WERE PROVIDED TO THE SECRETARIAT AND ALL REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STUDY GROUP.

8. COMMENT. WE BELIEVE THAT THIS FIRST MEETING OF THE STUDY GROUP REPRESENTS A GOOD BALANCE BETWEEN THE PRESS TO SEE A PROGRAM OF ARMAMENTS PLANNING COME TO FRUITION AND THE REALIZATION THAT TO HARMONIZE NATIONAL ARMAMENTS PROGRAMS INTO A COHERENT NATO PROGRAM WE NEED FIRST TO UNDERSTAND THE NUANCES OF THE INDIVIDUAL NATIONAL PROGRAMS. WE WILL NEED TO WATCH CAREFULLY ANY ATTEMPT TO SUBVERT A PAPS BY MERELY RELEGATING IT TO THE CNAD APPARATUS. AT THIS TIME, WE BELIEVE THAT WE ARE NOT READY TO AGREE WITH THE CHAIRMAN'S AND IS (DEFENSE SUPPORT) REPS OPINIONS THAT A WEALTH OF MATERIAL EXISTS IN THE CNAD GROUPS, ONLY WAITING FOR THE STUDY GROUP TO PLUCK IT OUT. WE BELIEVE THAT WHAT WE ARE LOOKING FOR IN A PAPS IS A PERMANENT PLANNING

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 NATO 00472 02 OF 02 272153Z

TOOL. IT MAY BE THAT AFTER EXAMINING THE NATIONAL ARMAMENTS PLANNING PROCESSES, THE ONLY VIABLE OPTION FOR NATIO IS TO RATIONALIZE THE ARMAMENTS REPLACEMENT SCHEDULES AND SEEK TO MAXMIMIZE THE OPPORTUNITIES FOR STANDARDIZATION AND INTEROPERABILITY. HOWEVER, IF THIS IS THE ONLY REALISTIC OPTION OPEN TO NATO, WE BELIEVE THAT PROVISION MUST BE MADE ON A PERMANENT BASIS TO CONDUCT THE ANALYSIS REQUIRED. WE RECOMMEND, THEREFORE, THAT AS THE FIRST STEP IN THE PROCESS, WASHINGTON CONSIDER FAVORABLY THE CALL FOR A PRESENTATION ON THE US ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM. END COMMENT.

9. ACTION REQUESTED. WASHINGTON GUIDANCE BY FEB 4 1977 ON THE FEASIBILITY OF MAKING A PRESENTATION ON THE US ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM ALONG THE LINES INDICATED IN PARA 6. STRAUSS-HUPE

CONFIDENTIAL

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 30-Aug-1999 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** n/a  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 27-Jan-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977NATO00472  
**Document Source:** ADS  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** 11652 GDS  
**Errors:** n/a  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** NATO  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770191/baaabbmf.tel  
**Line Count:** 241  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Message ID:** b99484de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 5  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** A. AC/259-D/516 DTD 4 OCT 76 B. STATE 013138 DTG 192350Z JAN 77.  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 29-Sep-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 3680996  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** PERIODIC ARMAMENTS PLANNING SYSTEM (PAPS)  
**TAGS:** NATO MILI OCON  
**To:** STATE SECDEF  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkgvwkey:** odb://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/b99484de-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009